

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 18 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 12, 14-17, 19-27, 40-51, 53-60 and 63 are pending in the instant application.

Claims 1-9, 12, 14-17, 19-27, 40-51, 53-60 and 63 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Claims 1, 14, 20, 40, and 53 have been amended. The Applicants submit that claims 1-9, 12, 14-17, 19-27, 40-51, 53-60 and 63 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections. No new matter has been entered by this amendment. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the Applicants' specification and drawings and, in particular, on pages 12-13, paragraph [0041].

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-8, 12, 14-17, 19-27, 40-47, 49-51, 53-60, 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Daly (US Pat No. 6,122,503) in view of McConnell (US 6,418,306) and Leung (US 6,195,546). Also, claims 9, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Daly in view of McConnell and Leung and further in view of Seazholtz et al (US 5,790,952). Further, claims 9, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Daly in view of McConnell and Leung and further in view of D' Avello et al (US 4,831,647). The Applicants traverse the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 and submit that claims 1-9, 12, 14-17, 19-27, 40-51, 53-60 and 63 are in condition for allowance.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970).

The Applicants traverse the rejections because the prior art references do not teach or suggest all of the claimed features. Claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "receiving a

first item of information relating to a new or revised agreement between a wireless service provider and a subscription company servicing the first wireless device, the first item of information corresponding to at least one wireless service provider that is associated with a local calling area; ... receiving a second item of information related to an autonomous registration event by the wireless device, the *second item of information obtained via protocol analysis that includes monitoring communications from the wireless devices and upon detecting a registration signal, outputting information relating to the registration signal.*"

None of the references teach or suggest monitoring communications for detecting registration signals using protocol analysis as recited in claim 1. The Examiner relies upon Daly as teaching receiving the information via IS-41 link (citing column 5, line 52 – column 6, line 9 and column 10, lines 1-15). However, Daly is devoid of teaching obtaining information via protocol analysis as recited in claim 1. Thus, the application of McConnell and Leung, with respect to the rejection of claim 1, would not cure the deficiencies of Daly. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Daly in view of McConnell and Leung. Claims 14, 20, 40, and 53 have been amended in a manner substantially similar to that of claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1, the Applicants submit that claims 14, 20, 40, and 53 are also patentable over Daly in view of McConnell and Leung. Claims 2-8 and 12 depend from what should be an allowable claim 1. Claims 15-17 and 19 depend from what should be an allowable claim 14. Claims 21-24 and 27 depend from what should be an allowable claim 20. Claims 41-47 and 51 depend from what should be an allowable claim 40. Claims 54, 55, 57-60, and 63 depend from what should be an allowable claim 53. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 2-8, 12, 15-17, 19, 21-24, 27, 41-47, 51, 54, 55, 57-60, and 63 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Daly in view of McConnell and Leung and further in view of Seazholtz, as well as over Daly in view of McConnell and Leung and further in view of D' Avello et al. Claim 9 depends from what should be an allowable claim 1. Claim 48 depends from what should be an allowable claim 40. For at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claims 1 and 40, the Applicants submit that claims 9 and 48 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 18 2006

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance is requested. It is submitted that the foregoing amendments and remarks should render the case in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, as the cited references neither anticipate nor render obvious that which the applicant deems to be the invention, it is respectfully requested that claims 1-9, 12, 14-17, 19-27, 40-51, 53-60 and 63 be passed to issue.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CHARLES M. LINK II, ET AL.

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicants' Attorneys

By: Marisa J. Dubuc
Marisa J. Dubuc
Registration No. 46,673
Confirmation No. 8769
Customer No. 36192

Date: September 18, 2006
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone No: (860) 286-2929
Fax No: (860) 286-0115